The Only Way To Stop Plane Hi-Jacking, P. 3

Who Else Builds Doves With Multiple Heads and Penetration Devices?

"I consider the Department of Defense to be a Department of Peace."

—President Nixon at press conference, Feb. 6

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 4 FEBRUARY 24, 1969 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Who's Running Foreign Policy — Nixon or Laird?

On *Face The Nation* Feb. 9 and the *Today* show Feb. 13 Secretary Laird managed completely to distort the realities of the arms race. The Secretary never lets an occasion pass to note that his role has changed since he went from the Republican minority on the House Appropriations defense subcommittee to the top job at the Pentagon. His TV appearances show that his role hasn't changed at all. He was a mouthpiece for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military-industrial complex on the Hill and he remains their mouthpiece, vastly amplified, as Secretary of Defense. What is more, he talks as if he were running U.S. foreign policy. Where Nixon is cautious and Secretary of State Rogers has been silent, Laird is off and running hard in a campaign to step up U.S. arms expenditure. Where Nixon has shifted from "superiority" to "sufficiency" to make Moscow more receptive, Laird has made clear his preference for the abrasive term. Where Nixon has suggested parallel progress on missiles and political issues, Laird on *Face The Nation* said there must be "progress, not only in Paris but also in the Middle East" *before* missile talks can be held. Where the Nixon Administration has ordered a complete review of the military budget, Laird is jumping the gun to plug for the anti-ballistic missile. Where Nixon by sending the Non-Proliferation Pact to the Senate has taken a first step toward relaxation of tension, Laird is beating Goldwater-style alarms. Nixon is soon going to have to decide whether he or Laird is running the show.

Beyond Mao's Wildest Dreams

The most striking divergence between them is in the treatment of the supposed Chinese missile threat. The President said Feb. 7 he did not "buy the assumption" that the Sentinel ABM was simply to protect us from attack by China. But two days later Laird was saying the opposite and on the *Today* show he twice said we had to build the Sentinel because "we do not want to become hostage of the Chinese." The overwrought phrase conjured up pictures of a heroine in an old movie melodrama held by Chinese white slavers. Laird said he thought the Chinese might fire their first ICBM within the next 18 months "and they might [he didn't say when] develop some 18 to 20 of these missiles." How will a nation with 18 to 20 missiles hold hostage a nation which can deliver (latest Pentagon figures) 4200 warheads? By slipping fissionable marijuana into our chop suey?

Laird said on the *Today* show that McNamara's "appraisal of that [Chinese] situation is correct", as if McNamara agreed with this nightmare. McNamara in his final defense posture statement a year ago noted that the Chinese ICBM program was lagging, said that China would not have a "significant number" of ICBM's until the mid-70s and declared that these would be rather slow and unreliable. Less than a month ago, Secretary Clifford in his last defense posture statement reported continued Chinese delay not only in deploying an ICBM but even intermediate range missiles. He said this indicated "serious problems", perhaps due to the Cultural Revolution. The Pentagon's experts two years ago expected the first Chinese ICBM shot before the end of 1967. Laird will have to scrape up a pretty fervent Maoist to find someone ready to believe the U.S. in danger of being held hostage by China.

Laird's discussion of the relative anti-missile spending of the U.S. and the USSR was equally fantastic. Laird was asked on *Face The Nation,* "Can you tell us what the Russians' anti-ballistic missile situation is? How many cities? How fast a deployment? Has it been speeded up or slowed down? How do they compare?" The answer, as provided less than a month ago by Clifford's last posture statement, is that construction has been curtailed on the ABM around Moscow, the only place where the Russians began to build one. "It is the consensus of the intelligence community," Clifford reported, that this GALOSH system, as it is called, "could provide only a limited defense of the Moscow area and could be seriously degraded by currently proposed U.S. weapons systems." Indeed this Russian ABM, Clifford said, "resembles in certain important respects the Nike-Zeus system which we abandoned years ago because of its limited effectiveness." It is, in other words, obsolete.

Instead of giving an honest answer, Laird plunged into a numbers game. He said "this past year the Russians have spent $4 for every $1 that we have spent on anti-strategic weapons systems." He then cut this down to $3.70 and four days later on the *Today* show made it $3.50 to $1. By using the term "anti-strategic weapons systems," Laird could lump Russian anti-bomber with anti-missile defenses. The excuse always adduced in our appropriations hearings for maintaining so many intercontinental bombers (646 as compared with the

(Continued On Page Four)

Eternal Vigilance Dept

All The Way Back To Those Pinkoes Who First Made Cannibalism A Dirty Word

"Subversion in one form or another is as old as history."

—Rep. Richard Ichord (D. Mo) *pleading with the House Rules Committee Feb. 4 to continue the Un-American Activities Committee, though with its name changed to the Committee on Internal Security. The House was expected to vote the change as we went to press.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NIXON'S CHOICE AS DIRECTOR of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is no flaming crusader for disarmament. Gerard C. Smith was right hand man to Dulles on arms negotiations and seems to have shared his apocalyptic cold war views. Under Rusk, Smith was one of the architects of that monstrosity, the Multi-Lateral Nuclear Force. When Fulbright tried to question Smith about the MLF at his confirmation hearing, Smith dismissed it as "a dead issue." But a week later in the February *Interplay,* which Smith publishes, there appeared an article by Smith suggesting "some kind of joint European nuclear force," a variant of the MLF. During the 1961 Berlin crisis Smith proposed that the U.S. and its allies answer any Berlin blockade with a sea blockade of the Soviet Union at the Turkish and Danish straits, though he wrote this might "trigger off general war." The text may be found in the confirmation hearing. It shows that in 1961 he thought the search for world law "illusory" as long as there were "both communist and free systems." But in last November's issue of his magazine, Smith said "a return to the cold war would have nothing in it for anyone," and termed "arms control" in the vital interests of the U.S. and the world.

IT WAS A PLEASURE TO LIVE TO SEE the day when Richard Nixon would turn his back on witch-hunting, as he did at his last press conference when asked whether he knew the charges made against Charles W. Yost at Yost's confirmation hearing before Senate Foreign Relations. These came from a spokesman for something called the Liberty Lobby, and sounded as if they had been fished out of the House Un-American Activities Committee files, as they probably were. "The relationship between Yost and Hiss was so close," the League's spokesman testified before Fulbright cut him off in disgust, "that Yost was entertained in Hiss's apartment." The Hiss case started Nixon on the road to the Presidency. Now, in defending Yost's loyalty and judgment, and in saying that he was interested "in his capability to handle the problems of the future and not events that occurred over 20 years ago," Nixon seemed to be burying that part of his own past as well as Yost's.

THOUGH NIXON ABOLISHED PARTISANSHIP IN THE Post Office, he is maintaining it in the District of Columbia City Council. Blacks here are generally disappointed with the three men he has named. The new chairman, Gilbert Hahn, Jr., whose family owns the largest shoe store chain in the area, is a conservative Republican who campaigned for Nixon last year and was for Goldwater in 1964. He opposed the reappointment of Walter Washington, the District's White House-appointed black mayor. To replace the liberal Republican Nevius on the Council, a white whom the blacks respected, Nixon chose an active Negro Republican Baptist pastor little in tune with majority black sentiment. Nixon's other choice, also unpopular with militants, was Sterling Tucker of the National Urban League who replaces the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, a close associate of the Rev. Martin Luther King. That, too, is a shift to the right and to an unrepresentative City Council.

STUDENTS OF THE ARMS RACKET may now read for

Startling Admissions in The Pueblo Affair

"The accuracy of virtually all the USS Pueblo's navigation equipment has been challenged by one of the five admirals conducting the Navy court of inquiry into the North Korean seizure of the intelligence ship. The challenge opens to serious question for the first time the U.S. insistence that the vessel never violated the territorial waters claimed by North Korea. Lt. Edward R. Murphy, executive officer and navigator of the ship, acknowledged yesterday that he had no truly accurate navigational aids to rely on — with the exception of radar and use of radar was restricted by the need to maintain electrical silence while on the intelligence mission. Under questioning from Rear Adm. Edward R. Grimm, Murphy said he most frequently relied on LORAN, an instrument he said resulted in "a fairly constant error of about 5 nautical miles." The Pueblo had charts of the North Korean coast, but they were prepared from 1950 to 1953 and had 'obvious errors' which made it difficult to determine the ship's position. Murphy described as 'a fabrication' the chart by the North Koreans which alleged 17 intrusions into territorial waters by the Pueblo. But he disclosed that 11 of the alleged intrusions were taken directly from Pueblo's LORAN log book. The LORAN readings were known to be inaccurate by the Pueblo crew but the North Koreans could not be convinced of the error made by the detection device, Murphy said."

—Abridged from a dispatch by Robert Walters in the Washington Star *Feb. 5, the only account we saw which covered these crucial revelations.*

U.S. Scientists Rebut Laird's Argument That Sentinel Would Be A Bargaining Card

"Now as far as the ABM is concerned, we have an opportunity I think within the not too far distant future to move into talks with the Soviet Union on offensive and defensive missile systems. And I do not want to be in a position when we go into those talks, if we do, with one hand tied behind our backs. I think it's most important, as we go into those talks, to have defensive as well as offensive missile systems up for discussion, and debate and negotiations."

—Defense Secretary Laird: press conference Jan. 30

"The deployment now of the Sentinel missile defense woud decisively limit the U.S. Government's freedom to negotiate when the strategic talks begin. Politically, the dismantling of an existing system would be very difficult. Thus Sentinel would effectively preclude U.S. negotiations aimed at forestalling a Soviet defensive system. It is the deployment of Sentinel, not its deferral, which ties the hands of the U.S. Government in future negotiations. A deferred system can always be built later."

"Moreover, if negotiated agreements are not able to forestall a Soviet missile defense system — now universally agreed to be only a token defense of a single city — then the United States MIRV [independently guided multiple warhead missiles] cannot be halted. Its avowed purpose was the penetration of a Soviet city missile defense. But the MIRV program will multiply U.S. warheads several times, threatening Soviet land-based missiles and encouraging a Soviet MIRV program. Soviet multiplication of warheads on each launcher will threaten, in turn, U.S. land-based missiles. ABMs on both sides will then be thought by some on each side to neutralize sea-based missiles. And both sides will then fear that neither land nor sea-based missiles are reliable deterrents. In this way, and by strengthening political, economic and military vested interests on both sides, U.S. deployment of ABM and MIRV will generate pressures not likely to be controllable in emerging U.S.-Soviet strategic talks."

—The Federation of American Scientists Feb. 6 opening a campaign against ABM and MIRV as destabilizing factors likely to cost $50 billion in 10 years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves Richard A. Stubbing's study of the low efficiency and high profits which mark the electronics produced for U.S. planes and missiles to which we referred in our last issue. Senator Fulbright put it into the *Congressional Record* Feb. 7 (at page S1450) and protested the Pentagon's effort to classify it. The study shows that aerospace ranked second only to drugs among ten leading industries in rate of return on net worth from 1957-64. Aerospace averaged 15.6% but the drug industry topped even our pampered and heavily subsidized arms and space industry, with an average return of 16.3%

SINCE THERE IS LITTLE competitive bidding in arms and much of aerospace operates with government owned facilities, this drug profit record is extraordinary. To understand why read the article by James L. Goddard, the former head of the Food and Drug Administration in the March issue of *Esquire*. The drug industry is an even smoother racket. Like the arms makers it, too, uses government research facilities — and succeeds in making the public pay twice for the same research, first in taxes and then in profits on brand names. Goddard exposes the interlocking establishment of drug companies, doctors, druggists and scientists who join in exploiting the poor, the sick and the aged by fantastic overpricing. Goddard tells of his unsuccessful effort to bring about publication of a national Drug Compendium so individuals, like big institutional purchasers, could also save money buying under generic instead of trade names. He implies that the only way out may be to make the drug industry a public utility. A better way would for government owned drug plants to sell basic products in competition with the big drug companies and force prices down to reasonable levels.

ON THE MOVE — BUT IN WHICH DIRECTION? An article in the January *Reader's Digest* by Carl Rowan and David Mazie proclaims "Black Capitalism On The Move," and says "Negro self-help projects are successfully moving blacks into the mainstream of American life." But the president of an association of Negro mortgage bankers told a membership luncheon (*New York Times,* Feb. 13) that black-owned businesses of "significance" are fewer in number than they were 40 years ago. Example: in 1929 there were 49 Negro-owned commercial banks in 38 cities, now there are 20 in 19 cities. The head of Harlem's new $32 million Freedom National Bank told the same meeting affluent blacks were not supporting it.

THE U.S. NAVY ALWAYS LEAKS SCARE stories about its Soviet rival as Congressional appropriation time rolls around. The Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean is this year's favorite bogey. But Britain's Defense Secretary Healey, in an interview with *Der Spiegel* (London *Times* Feb. 11) says it is "still substantially smaller than the Italian Navy" and if war broke out would be sunk "within minutes" by NATO's forces.

The Only Way To Stop Plane Hi-Jacking

So far as we can recall the speech made in the Senate Feb. 7 by Young of Ohio is the first in which any member of Congress has dared suggest that the U.S. resume relations with Cuba. We salute him for it. The best practical argument is that this is the only way to stop plane hi-jackings. No one hi-jacks planes to countries with which the U.S. has relations because the hi-jacker would be sent back with the plane to face criminal penalties. The loftiest argument is moral and might help the Czechs. The Russians claim the right to put the heat on their satellites if they show any sign of deviating from "the Socialist commonwealth." The analog to this is the Caracas doctrine by which the U.S. expels from the Organization of American States any Latin country which threatens to deviate from our "capitalist commonwealth." The Warsaw pact theoretically protects its members from such Big Brother intervention. So theoretically does the Bogota Pact which established the OAS. For 10 years we have nevertheless waged economic war against Cuba, strangling its commerce, pressuring other nations to boycott its trade, imposing privation upon its people. Yet a Wall Street Journal survey two days before Young's speech reported that despite 10,000 dissenters in jail "Most Cubans Appear Content With Castro's 10-Year Old Regime . . . Improved Education, Health, Wages Win Favor." Young points out that we have not broken relations with a single military-Fascist dictatorship, even Peru's, which seized the property of Standard Oil — holy of holies! Cuba has long offered to negotiate compensation for nationalized U.S. property if we resumed relations. Isn't it time for a change?

The Failure of The Alliance and The No. 1 Question of Latin America's Future

Colombia ranks third in Latin America in total U.S. assistance. The results, as set forth in a report just released by Senator Fulbright, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are dim.

Fulbright assigned Ellen O. Schwarz of the Committee staff to study Colombia as a case history in U.S. aid. The 94-page report and the accompanying 100-page report by the Comptroller General after 18 months of work represent the most thorough study of its kind yet made. It covers the Alliance for Progress period since 1962, when economic assistance totalled $732 million. During that time the per capita gross national product increased only from $276 to $295 a year, an annual average of 1.2% compared to the Alianza goal of 2.5%. The peso depreciated from 8.50 to the dollar in 1961 to 16.45 last August.

The number of functional illiterates, despite considerable aid to education, is up from 5 to more than 6 million in a population of 19.8 million. Agrarian reform has provided land titles to only 54,000 of close to 500,000 landless families whose numbers are increasing by 10% a year. The report reveals that the major emphasis has been on aid to the large commercial farmers "at the expense of rural social progress." Taxes have been increased but only lately have efforts been made to improve collection. Colombia "has barely begun to tackle" the problem of better income distribution "and the country's social structure remains essentially unchanged, with close to two-thirds of the population not participating in the economic and political decision making process."

In attempting to induce economic growth while braking inflation "the rhetoric of the Alliance for Progress was lost in the arcane world of international finance." Despite some short term success, the report says somberly that U.S. assistance helped successive Colombian governments "postpone making more basic reforms."

A younger generation of Latins will conclude sooner or later that the price of U.S. aid was to maintain an incompetent and heartless oligarchy in power. Without this aid, and U.S. coaching in counterinsurgency, the oligarchy would have to act or face social revolution. Any revolutionary program could do better than the Alliance has. Let us put it in the baldest arithmetic. Alliance aid has amounted to less than $7 per capita per year. Can anyone doubt that Colombia's poor could do far better than that on their own if idle labor were put to work on idle land by a leadership able to inspire and unite them?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Laird Wildly Misleading On Offensive Missiles — U.S. Has 4-to-1 Lead

(Continued From Page One)

Russians' 150) in the missile era is that this forces the Soviets to divert resources to bomber defense. But a high official with access to the figures said that even if the cost of Russia's SAM's [surface-to-air] and interceptors were lumped with its anti-missile spending, Laird's ratio was exaggerated. Maybe the total was fattened by adding in the cost of the SAM's Moscow has supplied North Vietnam. For anti-ballistic missiles, an official told Robert C. Maynard (*Washington Post,* Feb. 14), "We are spending at least as much money as the Russians are." Another reporter was told, "I cannot declassify the figures to give you the real picture." The Pentagon refused to explain Laird's figures on the same ground. This is selective declassification in a numbers game.

A New Kind Of Inflation

Laird laid it on thick when he said a ratio of $3.50 to $1 was "very close to a $7 ratio as far as effort is concerned" *(Face The Nation)* or "seven times the effort we're making in defensive weapons systems" (*Today* show). To grasp this whopper, you have to understand how these comparative figures are arrived at. The Soviet defense budget is about 16 billion rubles. The official exchange rate would make this about $17.5 billion dollars. But the intelligence experts multiply the 16 billion by three and estimate the budget in dollar terms as $50 billion. This is based on the view that the same level of effort in this country would cost three times as much. So whatever figures Laird got were already multiplied by three in dollar terms. Laird multiplied them again by two to get his "7 times our effort."

All these numbers are highly speculative. The Russians do not make a detailed budget available, and theirs like ours no doubt hides military items under other headings. What little is known can easily be juggled by taking certain time spans. Strategic systems, whether offensive or defensive, are long-range projects. The Russians are trying belatedly to catch up. Laird went on to say that in *offensive* strategic weapons, they were spending a ratio of $3 to every $2 we spent. One wonders what time span he picked. The figures are incredible for *any* time span. Laird on the *Today* show even said the Russians were not only "now outspending us" but "they've caught up to us in the offensive weapons system." This is in gross contradiction to the latest Pentagon figures. These show (p. 42 Clifford statement on the 1970 Budget dated last Jan. 15) that while the USSR now has 900 ICBMs compared with our 1,054, when Polaris submarines and bombers are added, our total strategic offensive forces can deliver 4200 warheads as compared with their 1200. The offensive missile gap in our favor is more than 4-to-1, and the 4200 warheads are 10 times as many as the 400 McNamara estimated were enough to destroy the Soviet Union as a viable society.

Laird's picture becomes even more misleading when quality as well as numbers are taken into account. The Soviet ICBMs are liquid-fuel; the kind we began to phase out in the Fall of 1962. Of our 1,054 ICBMs only 216 are liquid-fueled (Atlas and Titans). Clifford's last report said "we now believe" deployment of a solid fuel missile "has started." The liquid-fuel missile takes 15 minutes to set off; the solid fuel, less than a minute. The liquid fuel is so full of valves and controls, misfires are to be expected. So the Soviet ICBMs, like its anti-ballistic missiles, are already obsolete by our standards. We hope that when the anti-ballistic missile hearings start, Senators will put Laird on the spot and make him justify his wild statements.

How can Nixon expect the Russians to take his offers of negotiation seriously when his Secretary of Defense is allowed to talk in so loose and inflammatory a way? *Feb. 17*

Military-Industrial-Labor Complex?

"Top labor officials have been briefed by the military on the vital role they are to play in the construction, testing and installation phases of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile defense network . . . Each [ABM] will require the employment of 900 to 1,375 construction workers . . . The Sentinel plan was spelled out for the leaders of major trade unions in a special briefing recently in the AFL-CIO building in Washington, D.C. . . . Included . . . were M. A. Hutcheson Carpenters' General President, AFL-CIO Building Trades President C. J. Hagerty . . . A SENSCOM [Sentinel Systems Command] officer made clear '. . . the status of Sentinel employment as one of national priority. Avoidance of lockouts and work stoppages is necessary if this nation is to meet the projected Chinese Communist threat of the mid-70s'."

—The Carpenter (Brotherhood organ) January 1969.

For readers who want more ammunition in the fight against the ABM, there are packets available from the Federation of American Scientists at $1, Room 313, 2025 I St. N.W., Washington, D.C., 20006 and from SANE, at 75¢, 381 Park Ave. South, NYC 10016.

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 2/24/69

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED